

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been cancelled without prejudice, and new claims 2-42 have been added. (Applicant notes that claim 1 was not cancelled for patentability reasons. Rather, claim 1 was cancelled in favor of new claims 2-42, many of which are broader than claim 1 in many respects.) Claims 2-42 are now pending. Applicant respectfully requests reexamination and reconsideration of the application in light of the amendments and the following remarks.

As an initial matter, Applicant encloses proposed changes to Fig. 7, which are marked in red. These changes correct typographical errors in Fig. 7. Namely, the proposed changes add two missing "minus" symbols to the vertical axis of Fig. 7. The proposed changes also correct a typographical error on the horizontal axis of Fig. 7, which was inadvertently labeled "MHZ" rather than "GHZ." This proposed change also makes the figures consistent with the specification. (See, e.g., specification, paragraphs 42-52.) Applicant will make the proposed changes to the drawings once the changes have been approved.

Turning now to the rejection of claim 1 in view of US Patent 5,138,436 to Koepf ("Koepf") and US Patent 5,917,388 to Tronche et al. ("Tronche"). Independent claims 2 and 36 specify that electronic components are loosely coupled (that is, with at least 10 db attenuation) to a transmission line. Neither Koepf nor Tronche teach or suggest such loose coupling. Indeed, those references seem to teach against a loose or lossy coupling in favor of a tighter coupling with minimal loss of power through the coupling. (See, e.g., Koepf col. 6, lines 46-60.) Moreover, loose coupling of the electronic components to the transmission line provides advantages and is therefore neither trivial nor a mere design choice. Because of the loose coupling, each electronic component draws less power from a signal propagating on the transmission line. The signal on the transmission line therefore is attenuated less by each electronic component than it would be with tighter coupling. Therefore, independent claims 2 and 36 patentably distinguish over Koepf and Tronche.

Independent claims 26 and 40 provide a contactless, electromagnetic communication directly between two integrated circuits. Again, neither Koepf nor Tronche teach or suggest this. Therefore, independent claims 26 and 40 also patentably distinguish over Koepf and Tronche.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a discussion with Applicant's attorney would be helpful, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (925) 456-3915.

Although Applicant believes that all necessary extensions of time have been requested and all necessary fees have been provided for, to the extent necessary, Applicant petitions the Director for any extension of time deemed necessary for acceptance of this paper, and Applicant authorizes the Director to charge any fee deemed necessary for acceptance of this paper to Deposit Account No. 50-0285 (order no. P147-US).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 20, 2002

By: N. Kenneth Burraston

N. Kenneth Burraston
Registration No. 39,923

FormFactor, Inc.
Legal Department
2140 Research Dr.
Livermore, CA 94550
925-456-3915
925-294-8147 Fax

